37 Am. Jur. 2d Fraud and Deceit § 133

American Jurisprudence, Second Edition | May 2021 Update

Fraud and Deceit

George Blum, J.D., John Bourdeau, J.D., Romualdo P. Eclavea, J.D., Janice Holben, J.D., Karl Oakes, J.D. and Eric C. Surette, J.D.

- IV. False Representations
- F. Intent to Deceive, or to Induce Reliance; Knowledge of Falsity
- 3. Particular Kinds of Representations, Transactions, Relief, etc.
- c. Transactions

§ 133. Exchange of property

Topic Summary | Correlation Table | References

West's Key Number Digest

West's Key Number Digest, Fraud 13(3)

Forms

Am. Jur. Pleading and Practice Forms, Fraud and Deceit §§ 193 to 196 (Complaints, petitions, or declarations—Fraud in exchange transactions)

As a rule, in order to constitute fraud, a party to an exchange transaction must have made representations with an intent to deceive, either knowing the representations to be false or making them in culpable ignorance of their truth or falsity. However, a positive misrepresentation made in the exchange of real property for other realty or for personalty may amount to fraud not only where it was made knowingly but also where it was made innocently although carelessly and recklessly without knowledge of its falsity. In such a case the definite assertion as a fact of that which is untrue concerning that of which the party has no knowledge is tantamount in its effects to the assertion of something which the party knows to be untrue.

In an action for damages for fraudulent representations inducing an exchange of land for corporate stock, it has been held that fraud may be predicated upon a false statement respecting the value of the property in which the capital of the corporation was invested, even though the defendant believed the statement to be true when the defendant made it.⁶

© 2021 Thomson Reuters. 33-34B © 2021 Thomson Reuters/RIA. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works. All rights reserved.

Footnotes

1	McMeen v. Whipple, 23 Ill. 2d 352, 178 N.E.2d 351 (1961).
2	Kincaid v. Tant, 180 S.W. 1103 (Tex. Civ. App. Fort Worth 1914).
3	Rhodes v. Uhl, 189 Iowa 408, 178 N.W. 394 (1920).
4	Aldrich v. Scribner, 154 Mich. 23, 117 N.W. 581 (1908); Beatty v. Bulger, 28 Tex. Civ. App. 117, 66 S.W 893 (1902).
5	Howe v. Martin, 1909 OK 105, 23 Okla. 561, 102 P. 128 (1909).
6	Romine v. Thayer, 74 Ind. App. 536, 128 N.E. 456 (1920).

End of Document

© 2021 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.